



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address *** OMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Vigginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 893,023	06 27 2001	Frank O'Mahony	884.405US1	3406
75	90 07 16 2003			
Schwegman, Lundberg, Woessner & Kluth, P.A. P.O. Box 2938 Minneapolis, MN 55402			EXAMINER	
			SEFER, AHMED N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			7876	

DATE MAILED: 07 16 2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/893,023	O'MAHONY ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		A. Sefer	2826
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	ppears on the cover she	et with the correspondence address
A SH THE - Exte after - If th - If NO - Failu - Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the property is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mail led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	l. t.136(a). In no event, however, n eply within the statutory minimum d will apply and will expire SIX (6 ute, cause the application to becc	nay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. me ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	oo patan tan asjaaman eesta ah ah maa kap		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02	2 May 2003	
2a) <u>⊡</u>	This action is FINAL . 2b) 1	This action is non-final.	
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the conditions of the condition.		
•	tion of Claims Claim(s) <u>13-18 and 26</u> is/are pending in the	application	
4)[4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr		
5\[7]	Claim(s) <u>27-45</u> is/are allowed.	awii iioiii consideratioi	
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requiremen	!
	tion Papers	or election requiremen	
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b)	disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. SUPER	RVISURY PATENT EXAMINER
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	, 5,	CHNOINGY CENTER 2800
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(a f)-(d) or (f).
a)) All b) Some * c) None of:		\mathcal{O}
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received	in Application No
* ;	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International E See the attached detailed Office action for a list	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2)	(a)).
14) 🗌 /	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
	a) The translation of the foreign language p Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome		
Attachmer	•		
2) Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 Noti	rview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ce of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/893,023

Art Unit: 2826

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 5/2/03 has been entered and new claims 26-45 have been added.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/2/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Okamura (USPN 5,521,541) in view of Chi (USPN 5,387,885) and Sano et al. (JP 2-158165) fail to teach the device structure as recited in the claims. Specifically, Applicants claim that any one of the references of record alone or in combination do not teach or suggest a signal wiring pattern having sufficiently low losses to make on-die salphasic clocking feasible.
- 3. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a signal wiring pattern having sufficiently low losses) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/893,023

Art Unit: 2826

5. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamura US Patent No. 5,521,541 in view of Chi US Patent No. 5,387,885 and Sano et al. (JP 2-158165).

Okamura discloses figs. 2-6 a microelectronic die comprising a clock signal source 102 to provide a clock signal; and a clock signal distribution network to distribute said clock signal to multiple clocked elements 106 within said microelectronic die, said clock signal distribution network including at least on-die interconnect section, but discloses neither the use of salphasic clocking techniques to distribute said clock signal nor an interconnect comprising first and second differential signal lines.

Chi discloses (see abstract) salphasic clocking techniques to distribute clock signals.

Sano et al disclose in figs. 4 and 5 an interconnect comprising first and second differential signal lines 221, 222 to carry a differential version of a clock signal, said first and second differential signal lines being substantially parallel to one another.

Therefore, it would have being obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a salphasic clocking techniques, since that would minimize phase shifts. It would have been obvious to employ an interconnect comprising first and second differential signal lines, since that would suppress a crosstalk between channels.

Regarding claim 14, Sano et al disclose at least a trace 210 on a metal layer being capacitively coupled to and non-parallel or substantially orthogonal (as in claim 15) with said first and second differential signal lines.

Regarding claim 16, Chi discloses a sinusoidal clock signal.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/893,023

Art Unit: 2826

6. Claims 17, 18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamura in view of Chi and Sano et al. as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Restle et al. (IEEE Symposium on VLSI Circuits Digest of Techincal Papers, 1998).

The combined references above do not specifically disclose grid-based or an H-tree within a clock distribution network.

Restle et al disclose (see page 2) H-tree and grid-based within a clock distribution network.

Therefore, it would have being obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use grid-based (as in claim 17) or H-tree (as in claim 18) clock distribution network, since that would result in zero or very nominal skew.

As to claim 26, Restle et al disclose in fig. 1 a microprocessor circuitry.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 27-45 are allowed.
- 8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

 The references of record do not teach or make obvious the device structure as recited in claims

 27 and 34.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rao et al. USPN 6,037,822 disclose a distribution of differential clock network (see fig 15).

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/893,023

Art Unit: 2826

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Sefer whose telephone number is (703) 605-1227.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (703) 308-6601.

ANS July 9, 2003